

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are pending in the present application and are rejected. Claims 1-4 are herein amended.

Applicants' Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

It is the position of the Office Action that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors, at the time of invention, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the Office Action notes that the term "linear strips" in claims 1 and 3 is deemed new matter. The Office Action states that the specification, as originally filed, does not provide support for the invention as now claimed.

In response, Applicants respectfully submit that the disclosure in the Figures, particularly Figures 2(a), 3 and 7(a), provides a sufficient disclosure of "linear strips." As seen in the Figures, printing convex portion 1 is linear. Furthermore, none of the Figures illustrate printing convex portions as non-linear. According to MPEP §2163, "[a]n applicant shows possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams and formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention." Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants' Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hasegawa et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0126247).

It is the position of the Office Action that **Hasegawa** discloses the invention as claimed. **Hasegawa** discloses a method for manufacturing a liquid crystal display type electro-optical device including a flexographic process. **Hasegawa** discloses in Figure 7(B) that meshes 119 for holding coating liquid 150 are formed on the surfaces of the projections 111 of the letterpress 110. **Hasegawa** also discloses in Figures 7(A) and 7(B) that the meshes 119 extend the whole length of projections 111 and have a continued triangular cross section. Further, in paragraph [0055], **Hasegawa** discloses that that pitch P3 of the mesh 119 (see Figure 7(B)) and the same-color pitch P1 of the color filters (See Figure 3(B)) are set to be equal.

In response, Applicants herein amend claims 1 and 3 in order to clarify the structure of the micro-projections and micro-stripes. With respect to claim 1, Applicants incorporate the limitation that the micro-projections are “formed into a truncated cone or in a cylinder” from claim 2. Meanwhile, with respect to claim 3, Applicants incorporate the limitation that the “cross section of the projected micro-stripes in a direction perpendicular to a longitudinal direction is trapezoidal or rectangular” from claim 4.

As noted above, the **Hasegawa** discloses a mesh 119. However, this mesh 119 consists of small projections which are triangular in cross-section. Thus, **Hasegawa** does not disclose or suggest micro-projections shaped as a “truncated cone or cylinder” as recited by amended claim

1. **Hasegawa** also does not disclose or suggest micro-stripes shaped with a cross section that is “trapezoidal or rectangular” as recited by amended claim 3. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claims 1 and 3 distinguish over **Hasegawa**. Applicants also submit that since these limitations were included in original claims 2 and 4, the amendment does not raise new issues requiring further search or consideration.

Applicants’ Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasegawa in view of Amano et al. (JP 2002-293049).

It is the position of the Office Action that **Hasegawa** discloses the invention as claimed, with the exception of teaching the micro-projections being formed in a truncated cone or cylinder and projected micro-stripes where the cross section of the projected microstripes is rectangular or trapezoidal in the direction perpendicular to the longitudinal direction. The Office Action relies on **Amano** to provide this teaching. The Office Action also relies on **Amano** to provide teachings relating to the size of the projections and grooves.

Amano discloses a resin relief printing plate 1 for forming an oriented film. As shown in paragraph [0014] and Figure 1, each plate 1 is formed with one printing projection 2, having a square shape in plan view. In paragraph [0019], dimensions of the micro-projections 3 distributed on the printing projections are recited.

First, Applicants submit that claims 2 and 4 are patentable due to their dependency on claims 1 and 3. As noted above, Applicants incorporate the limitations reciting the shape of the

micro-projections and micro-stripes into the independent claims. Furthermore, with respect to amended claims 1 and 3, Applicants submit that there is no suggestion or motivation in the art to modify **Hasegawa** by replacing the mesh 119 having a triangular cross-sectional shape with the micro-projections 3 of **Amano**. In fact, Applicants submit that **Hasegawa** *teaches away* from such micro-projections 3 by disclosing mesh 119 which extends the entire length of the projections 111.

Further, in paragraph [0055], **Hasegawa** discloses that the pitch P3 of the mesh 119 (Figure 7(B)) and the same-color pitch P1 of the color filters (Figure 3(B)) are set to be equal. Since the resin relief printing plate 1 of **Amano** is used for forming an oriented film, each plate 1 is formed with one printing projection 2 having a square shape in plan view, as shown in paragraph [0014] and Figure 1. Further, as shown in paragraph [0019] and Figure 2, the micro-projections 3 distributed on the printing projections 2 are spaced apart from each other. Therefore, there is no suggestion or motivation in the art to modify **Hasegawa** by replacing the meshes 119 with the micro-projections 3 of **Amano**. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the claimed invention distinguishes over the cited art and defines patentable subject matter. Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by applicants would be desirable to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicants' undersigned agent.

Amendment After Final
Serial No. 10/765,899
Attorney Docket No. 032111

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R.C.', is positioned above the printed name of the attorney.

Ryan B. Chirnomas
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 56,527
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

RBC/jl